

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 and 35-41 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9-13, 15, 35, 36, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsumagari et al. (US 6,360,057 B1).

Claims 5-7 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumagari et al. (US 6,360,057 B1) in view of Stonedahl (US 2002/0199198 A1).

Claims 3, 14, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumagari et al. (US 6,360,057 B1) in view of Koyama et al. (US 6,424,385 B1).

The claims as originally filed are believed to distinguish over the art of record, but have been amended nonetheless to correct minor informalities. Claim 41 has been further amended to distinguish over the cited art. No new matter has been added.

The independent claims are: 1, 15, 35, and 41.

Claimed Invention

The claimed invention is directed generally to accessing an information stream. In accordance with the present invention, event marker and time index pairs are received to timestamp an information stream. Segments of the information stream are produced based on the time indices. Groups of segments that are associated with the same event marker are formed. Each event marker is then presented, along with the segments that are associated with that event marker. For example, claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

obtaining a plurality of timestamps, each timestamp comprising an associated event marker and an associated time index referenced with respect to a time line of the information stream, wherein two or more timestamps can be associated with the same event marker;

producing segments of the information stream, each segment being associated with a timestamp and being determined based on the time index associated with the timestamp;

forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker; and

presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments, wherein the representation is arranged according to an arrangement format.

See also independent claims 15, 35, and 41.

The Tsumagari Reference

Tsumagari discloses an entry point processing function for a video recording and playback system. Tsumagari summarizes, in col. 2, lines 1-65, a system which allows a user to write or erase a mark (entry point) at an arbitrary recording position of video data, audio data, and the like. The system manages a hierarchy of information including program chain information (ORG_PGCI or UD_PGCIT, Fig. 6) for designating the playback order of objects. The program chain information (PGCI) includes one or more pieces of program information (PGI, Fig. 19) and one or more pieces of cell information (CI, Fig. 22). The cell information (CI) contains designation information (M_CI, Fig. 23) for designating an object to be played back. The designation information (M_CI) records entry point information (M_C_EPI, Fig. 25) for designating the playback position in an object. The entry point allows the user to recognize the recorded contents of a disc and to record/play back from a desired position.

Section 102 Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 15, 35, and 41

The Examiner's cite to Tsumagari is well taken. However, significant differences between the claimed invention and the cited reference exist. Following is a discussion of the distinctions. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the remarks which follow.

Claim 1 recites in part:

obtaining a plurality of timestamps, each **timestamp comprising an associated event marker and an associated time index** referenced with respect to a time line of the information stream, wherein two or more timestamps can be associated with the same event marker; (emphasis added)

See also independent claim 15.

The claim recites a "timestamp comprising an associated event marker and an associated time index." The Examiner cited Tsumagari's PTS (presentation time stamp, Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 15-22), which indicates the start time of the first frame in the packet of a VOB (video object), for allegedly teaching the claimed timestamp. Tsumagari's PTS, however, is simply a time value (i.e., "the start time of the first frame") and does NOT comprise either an event marker nor a time index.

The Examiner cited Tsumagari's entry point (Fig. 25) for allegedly teaching the claimed event marker. However, it is clear from Tsumagari's description in col. 10, lines 15-22

that his PTS does NOT comprise his entry point; his PTS is simply a time value (“the start time of the first frame”).

Thus, although Tsumagari discloses a “time stamp”, his time stamp is NOT the timestamp as recited in the pending claims. Tsumagari does not teach “obtaining a plurality of timestamps, each **timestamp comprising an associated event marker and an associated time index** referenced with respect to a time line of the information stream, wherein two or more timestamps can be associated with the same event marker” as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 15.

The Section 102 rejections of independent claims 1 and 15 are believed to be overcome for at least this reason. Furthermore, the additional references to Stonedahl and Koyama, likewise, do not teach the limitation of “obtaining a plurality of timestamps, each **timestamp comprising an associated event marker and an associated time index** referenced with respect to a time line of the information stream, wherein two or more timestamps can be associated with the same event marker,” so the combination of the references do not render obvious the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 15.

The Section 103 rejections of the dependent claims are believed to be overcome based on the allowability of their respective base claims 1 and 15.

Claim 1 recites in part:

obtaining a plurality of timestamps ...;

...

forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker; and presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments, wherein the representation is arranged according to an arrangement format. (emphasis added)

See also independent claims 15, 35, and 41.

The Examiner cited Tsumagari’s VOBs (video objects, Fig. 2), shown in greater detail in Fig. 3, for allegedly teaching the limitation of “forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker.”

The Examiner cited Figs. 23-25 and 27 for allegedly teaching the limitation of “presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments.” Respectfully, the Examiner has erred as to both limitations.

Tsumagari’s VOBs are NOT the “groups of segments” as recited in the pending claims. First, Tsumagari’s VOBs are not grouped based on an event marker. Rather, as best understood, the VOBs are grouped based on PTS (Fig. 3 shows that each VOB includes a PTS in its packet header). By comparison, the claims (e.g., claim 1) recite that “each group compris[es] those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker.” In other words, each group of segments of the information stream have the same event marker in common. As explained above, Tsumagari’s PTS does not comprise an entry point, his PTS is simply a time value (“the start time of the first frame” of a packet that constitutes a VOB). Therefore, Tsumagari’s VOBs are not group such that they have PTSs that comprise the same entry point.

Second, a review of Tsumagari’s entry points as illustrated in Figs. 25-27 do not reveal the claimed limitation of “forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker” or “presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments.” Fig. 25 simply shows the structure of an entry point.

Fig. 26 shows a display of the entry points (e.g. “barbeque with family”, “7th birthday of daughter”). A review of the discussion of Fig. 26 at column 20, lines 38-60 does not reveal “forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker” and then “presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments.” Instead, Fig. 26 shows a segment (PG1) entitled “barbeque with family” and another segment (PG2) entitled “7th birthday of daughter.” There is no teaching to form groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker, and then presenting the groups.

Fig. 27 illustrates the notion of setting an entry point at an arbitrary position of each program. Col. 20, lines 61-63. Tsumagari teaches that a user can decompose recorded programs 1-4 into arbitrary parts and enter the playback order of the decomposed parts in

different play lists #1, #2. Fig. 27 does not teach “forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker” and then “presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments.”

The Section 102 rejections of independent claims 1, 15, 35, and 41 are believed to be overcome. Furthermore, the additional references to Stonedahl and Koyama do not teach the limitations of “forming groups of segments, each group comprising those segments of the information stream whose timestamps comprise the same event marker” and then “presenting a representation of each event marker and a representation of its associated group of segments,” so the combination of the references do not render obvious the limitations of the independent claims 1, 15, 35, and 41.

The Section 103 rejections of the dependent claims are believed to be overcome based on the allowability of their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/George B. F. Yee/

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:jis
61340397 v1